

This is always a fundamental question, particularly for those of us who represent rural states.

As a Montanan, it is hard to talk about international trade without thinking about agriculture. Over the years, U.S. agriculture has undergone enormous changes, for reasons that are much broader than globalization. The U.S., as a whole, has changed dramatically. Where we live, where we work, the things we make, the technology we use to make things—all of these have changed since our parents' time.

We need a rural America that is not only stable and prosperous; we need a rural America that is compatible in the long-term with a 21st century characterized by mobility and rapid technological advancement. We need a farm economy that is highly adaptive and aggressively focused on competitiveness.

To accomplish this, we need sweeping changes in several areas. We will need more agricultural research—an area suffering from an appalling decline in federal support. We will need a farm policy that facilitates, rather than simply underwrites, the farm economy.

And we will need a vigilant search for new and growing markets.

Of course, many of these needs are beyond the ken of trade policy, but the search for new markets is not. That is why fundamentally we need a strategy that embraces the global trading system.

For the U.S. to remain a superpower in agriculture, we must see the world as it is, not as it used to be. That means we need to focus our attention on global negotiations that will create real fairness in agriculture trade. I share the concern of many about a trade policy agenda that focuses too much attention on bilateral agreements, at the expense of our broader efforts in the World Trade Organization.

Yet, in the trend toward globalization, the industrial world is moving ahead. We should not allow agriculture to be left behind. Leaving agriculture behind in the 20th century trading regime would be disastrous for U.S. farmers, if for no other reason than they are, on the whole, the most productive and technologically advanced in the world. A globalized economy and its institutions are the only forum in which American farmers' technological advantage is most powerful. American agriculture must move ahead to prosper.

We cannot shut agriculture out of the globalizing process. We cannot settle for the status quo, hoping that it will sustain us indefinitely. As the rest of the world's agricultural producers rapidly develop, we cannot hide behind high tariffs and high subsidies.

The U.S. represents only 5 percent of the world's consumers. Yet, in commodity after commodity, we produce far more than Americans can consume. That is true of beef and wheat, for example. And demand from our own 5 percent will likely grow much more

slowly than demand from the other 95 percent. There are only so many steaks any one well-fed American can eat. But in the developing world, demand for food still has much room to grow. The more their wealth grows, the more that consumption patterns will shift from low-cost, starchy foods to high-value sources of protein such as beef and wheat.

We are faced, then, with a simple choice: Either we try to turn back the clock to a time of inferior technology and a more insular world or we seek greater access to the markets of the other 95 percent of the world. The choice is clear.

As a nation, we have embarked on a policy of opening markets. This is a wise policy and a sound one. The fruit of this effort should be more and higher-paying jobs for U.S. workers, more abundant choices for our consumers, and greater markets for our farmers and ranchers.

Yet, if we are going to sell our products overseas, then we have to engage global markets. And we can't do that in a vacuum. This means negotiating trade agreements and fighting the distortions—such as high tariffs and high subsidies—that other countries use to undermine our competitiveness. In that fight, we have no better ally than Australia.

At the heart of the matter, engaging global markets means opening doors. And we won't succeed in opening doors to other markets if we won't open our own. We can't insist that China, Thailand, Taiwan, and Japan open their markets to our products, if we aren't also willing to open our markets to theirs. And I can't insist that Ambassador Zoellick accommodate my concerns in a free trade agreement, if I am not willing to offer my support in return.

When Ambassador Zoellick announced the administration's intention to negotiate a free trade agreement, many of us harbored concerns that he would negotiate a far different agreement than the one we have before us today. But the protections that American negotiators built into this agreement are strong. And I congratulate the Trade Representative's office for its skill in negotiating such a tough agreement.

Mr. President, I will support the U.S.-Australia free trade agreement. I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that this agreement is implemented fairly. And I look forward to working with the U.S. Trade Representative to make sure that all trade agreements are the best possible deal for Montana.

This is the time for engaging our allies and for opening the door to new markets. This is the time for planting the seeds of a greater world trade system. As the American farmer has done down through the centuries, we should labor today for a future of growth.

RECOGNIZING THE PROFESSIONALISM OF MS. CAROL MADONNA

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I recognize the efforts of Ms. Carol Madonna, a Brookings Institution LEGIS fellow, who has been a tremendous asset to me and my office during the past 18 months. Over the past year and a half, Carol has assisted me with fulfilling my responsibilities as a member of the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs. She has worked many long hours to address issues of concern to our men and women in the military, veterans, and Federal employees.

Mr. President, Carol Madonna is an excellent example of a dedicated Federal employee. She is always willing to pitch in and provide assistance. She is a very quick learner and an extremely hard worker. She adapts quickly to changing circumstances and is always responsive to situations. From early bird breakfasts with Pentagon officials to late vote evenings in the Senate, Carol was an invaluable member of my legislative staff and a quick study on the diverse and competing priorities that arise in the Senate on a regular basis. Her professionalism and dedication to getting the job done reflects well on the Defense Supply Center-Philadelphia, an agency within the Defense Logistics Agency, where Carol has been employed for the past 22 years.

Mr. President, Carol Madonna has many accomplishments that are worthy of mention. She is most proud, however, of her two sons, Dan Madonna, a teacher in Philadelphia, and Lee Madonna, who is about to receive his Associate's Degree from Delaware County Community College. As much as my staff and I will miss Carol, we wish her well as she joins her family in Philadelphia, and thank her for her wonderful service to the people of Hawaii and this great Nation.

EMPTY WORDS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column "Empty Words" by Frank Gaffney, which appears in today's Washington Times, be printed in the RECORD. I believe that this piece appropriately emphasizes the crucial role continued research plays in maintaining the credible nuclear deterrent of the United States. As more information becomes available regarding covert nuclear programs in North Korea and Iran, the sustainability and credibility of America's nuclear arsenal is of paramount concern.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, June 15, 2004]

EMPTY WORDS

(By Frank J. Gaffney Jr.)

The U.S. Senate gets back to work today after a week of bipartisan mourning of Ronald Reagan and tributes to his security policy legacy. It is fitting that the first orders